REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful and thorough examination of the present application. The Examiner is also thanked for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interviews of February 2, 2009 and February 23, 2009, during which the current claim rejections and the prior art were discussed, and during which the Examiner agreed that the claim amendments made herein would define over the prior art. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 37 have been amended. Dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 34, 38, 39, and 41 have been amended for consistency. Dependent Claim 6 has been cancelled for consistency. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 21, 28, and 37 based on a combination of Dellmo et al. and Lee et al. Independent Claim 12 was rejected further in view of Boucher et al., and Nguyen et al. As an initial matter, Applicants point out that Independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 37 have been amended to remove the recitation of the user network interface including a plurality of different connectors for coupling the cryptographic module to different network devices. Applicants understand that the Lee et al. reference will no longer be used in the Examiner's rejection.

Independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 37 have also been amended to recite the cryptographic processor communicates with the user network interface using a media independent interface

(MII), and the cryptographic module and the communications module use the MII to transfer encrypted data and communications module configuration operations therebetween. Independent Claims 1, 21, 28 and 37 have also been amended to recite the cryptographic module and the communications module are removably coupled thereto. Applicants submit that Dellmo et al. fails to disclose the cryptographic processor communicating with the user network interface using a media independent interface (MII), and the cryptographic module and the communications module using the MII to transfer encrypted data and communications module configuration operations therebetween, as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 28 and 37. Applicant further submits Dellmo et al. fails to submit the cryptographic module and the communications module being removably coupled, as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 21, 28, and 37. Additionally, Boucher et al., and Nguyen, add nothing to the critical deficiencies of Dellmo et al.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the amended independent claims are patentable over the prior art. In view of the patentability of the independent claims, it is submitted that their dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features, are also patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, these dependent claims require no further discussion herein.

II. Conclusion

In view of the arguments and amendments presented above, it is submitted that all of the claims are patentable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested in due course. If the Examiner determines any remaining informalities exist, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID S. CARUS
Reg. No. 59,291
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath
& Gilchrist, P.A.
255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401
Post Office Box 3791
Orlando, Florida 32802
407-841-2330
407-841-2343 fax
Attorney for Applicants